



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/598,404	04/02/2007	Stefanie Geilen	PAT-01179/BC1-0080	3818
77224	7590	09/28/2009	EXAMINER	
Mary E. Golota Cantor Colburn LLP 201 W. Big Beaver Road Suite 1101 Troy, MI 48084				SZEKELY, PETER A
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
		1796		
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/28/2009		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

MARJORIE.ELLIS@BASF.COM
Mgolota@CantorColburn.com
usptopatmail@cantorcolburn.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/598,404	Applicant(s) GEILEN ET AL.
	Examiner Peter Szekely	Art Unit 1796

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 August 2009.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-5,7-14,18 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) 19 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-5,7-14 and 18 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/95/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Newly submitted claim 19 is directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons: The composition of claims 1-5, 7-14 and 18 is classified in class 524, subclass 569. New claim 19 is directed to the method of coating is classified in class 427, subclass 404, necessitating a new search.

Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claim 19 is withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

2. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1-5, 7-14 and 18 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, because the specification, while being enabling for PVC plastisols, does not reasonably provide enablement for any other coating composition. The specification does not enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make or use the invention commensurate in scope with these claims. One of ordinary skill in the art would have to undertake undue experimentation in order to find out which other coatings can be utilized when practicing the instant invention. See *In re Wands*, 8 USPQ2d 1400, 1404 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

4. Claims 1-5, 7-14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. There is no mention of "coating composition"-s in the instant specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

7. Claim 1 recites the limitation "The PVC plastisol" in line 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

9. Claims 1-5, 7-14 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Colyer et al. 5,223,322, Hensler et al. 5,695,696 or Marecki 5,837,347, in view of Hubert et al. 6,162,504, Ko et al. 2002/0187341 or Regelski et al. 2004/0115398, with Pedersen et al. 6,228,925 as evidence.

10. The primary references have been discussed already. Hubert et al. disclose plastisol and solvent in claim 26. Ko et al. teach plastisol and solvent in claim 22. Regelski et al. recite plastisol and organic solvent I claim 20. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art, at the time the invention was made, to adjust the viscosity of the plastisol. Pedersen et al. is cited for their showing that paste resins (dispersion resins, emulsion polymerized resins, plastisol resins) have a particle size of 0.1-2 microns, while filler resins (extender resins, blending resins) have a particle size of up to 60 microns. See column 1, lines 15-46.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed 8/14/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. As far as the particle size of the dispersion resins and blending resins are concerned, Pedersen et al. answer applicants' arguments very effectively. The arguments concerning the rheology of the plastisols are not effective either. The thixotropy (pseudoplasticity) and dilatancy of an unfilled plastisol will depend not only on the resin but on the kind and amount of plasticizers used. When a small amount of plasticizer is used most plastisols are dilatant. When a large amount of plasticizer is used most plastisols are basically Newtonian. When a polymeric (polyester) plasticizer is used almost all plastisols are dilatant. When a high solvating plasticizer (butyl benzyl phthalate) is used most plastisols start out as thixotropic but they turn dilatant on standing. Applicants do not specify the amount of plasticizer and the kind of plasticizer used, making the limitations meaningless. Furthermore, the burden is shifted the applicants to prove that the references cited by the examiner do not show the

rheological characteristics claimed in the instant application. Since the PTO cannot conduct tests, so it is appropriate to shift the burden to applicants to do so. *In re Best*, 195 USPQ 430, 4330434 (CCPA 1977). Additionally, applicants have failed to show whether the dilatancy or pseudoplasticity of the individual resins and the finished plastisol has anything to do at all with the successful practice of the invention. The rejections are maintained.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter Szekely whose telephone number is (571) 272-1124. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:10 a.m.-4:40 p.m. Tuesday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Peter Szekely/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796

/P. S./
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1796
9/23/09